

**MINUTES OF THE
WEST LAFAYETTE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
October 25, 2004
*Revised***

Redevelopment Commission members present: Steve Belter, Earle Nay, Sandy Pearlman, Chris Corrigan, and Patsy Hoyer. Also in attendance: Mayor Jan Mills, Clerk Treasurer Judy Rhodes, City Attorney Bob Bauman, Development Director Josh Andrew, Bev Shaw, Charlotte Martin and Cindy Loerbs-Polley of the Development Department, Parks Superintendent Joe Payne, City Engineer David Buck, Tom Gall of TJ Gall & Associates, ***City Council member Patti O'Callaghan***, and citizens and members of the media.

Mr. Belter called the meeting to order at 12:36 pm. *(Directed to Ms. Loerbs-Polley)* Were all the appropriate notices posted and sent out? Ms. Loerbs-Polley answered yes they were.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Pearlman made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 20th meeting. Mr. Nay seconded. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Belter stated that the first item of business is the claims. Mr. Nay made a motion to authorize the trustee to pay the claims. Ms. Pearlman seconded.

Mr. Belter asked if Mr. Payne could give an update on the progress of the trails. Mr. Payne stated that the stone is down along the Davis Manor property as well as most of the stone being down near the Westminster property. The stone is down in the small piece that we added around the two sides of the basketball courts in Cumberland Park. We realized when the sidewalks and trail connections were finished, that area was never going to grow grass. A lot of people were using it, so we added that piece. All of those are ready for asphalt. The connection of the Wabash Heritage Trail to the overlook is also ready for asphalt. Due to some weather related problems, we won't completely finish until spring.

We have some other things going on and I'll refer to this new display board. *(Mr. Payne gave updates on different connection pieces, **pointing to North River Road; the section between Robinson and Happy Hollow.**)*

Mr. Belter asked what your guess on the timing of this is. Mr. Payne stated that if we are fortunate enough to receive the grant, we'd receive notice about this time next year and then it's about a two year process. To be honest with you, our hope would be to complete construction in '07.

Mr. Nay asked what the future is of the Happy Hollow Trail. Mr. Payne stated that there are a lot of foot paths on this map that aren't shown. Everything that is shown on here is considered to be usable by bicycle.

Mr. Belter asked what the timing on this piece is. (*Pointing to the map*) Mr. Payne stated that it may be soon. We have a preliminary survey that we are looking at with the options of trying to come up with some cost estimates and we can come back and tell you more this fall.

Mr. Nay asked, for the purpose of notes, if they could state which piece they are talking about. (*Mr. Payne gave an answer but it was spoken too quietly and was not understandable on the recorder.*)

Mr. Belter stated that I need to talk with you soon about this part (*Kent Avenue*) because I know that we are trying in the very near future to get a fiber connection into this building and this building (*Bio Analytical and Coffin buildings*). Mr. Payne stated that this whole concept partly grew out of the Sagamore Task Force in discussions with State Farm about that piece where there used to be a trailer park. State Farm is really the only business along there that we've had much involvement with thus far. To be honest with you, I don't know of anyone else along there, unless they were involved with the Task Force, that has any idea that we are working on this.

The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Nay made a motion to approve Resolution RC-2004-9. Ms. Pearlman seconded. Mr. Gall stated that I'll give you a little status report. The work is complete on Navajo and Salisbury, including the work in front of Huntington Bank. The INDOT permit has not yet come as was expected by October 15th. It was submitted in August to the district office, they forwarded it with a few comments to INDOT in Indianapolis who is disavowing any knowledge that it exists. Steve (Hardesty) has followed up on it numerous times and the follow up he made close to a month ago was them saying that they have no idea what we are talking about. He made a PDF file out of the entire application and emailed it to them. At this point they are making no commitment as to when they intend to review, comment, or respond to it. We do know from the district office that they are requesting each of the sidewalk pieces that come to a drive entry to be an INDOT standard curve ramp style that you do not currently use in the city. We know that they aren't happy about it because they don't like sidewalks in right of way on limited access highways. Right now we don't have an answer on when we are going to get that back and how many comments or changes they are going to ask for. Milestone's completion date was predicated on having that permit by the 15th. We'll have to deal with if we can we do it yet this fall or not depending on when we finally get a response from them. We don't know how many other changes they are going to have. Mr. Nay's concept to appropriate the money so that you would have sufficient contingency would still seem to be valid.

Another thing that you should be updated on with the work with Mr. Buck and Mr. Payne is that Huntington Bank agreed to and wrote a check to the city for over \$6,000 for half of the costs of their drive entrance. Their drive entrance involves a little more work relative to their existing facility than others have. Mr. Buck thought that it was something that they should participate in so he made the request. Their Indianapolis folks weren't too terribly interested in it so Mr. Andrew suggested that we talk to their local, primary person, Gary Neal, who said yes we should help. Mr. Neal contacted Indianapolis and within a day we had approval to start and an agreement that they would pay and I think the money is already here and in the bank. The appropriation was raised by \$6,042.50.

Mr. Belter asked Ms. Martin if we approve this appropriation and the sidewalk doesn't get built till spring, we won't have to re-appropriate it again, will we? Ms. Martin stated that is the case as long as we encumber the funds. Mr. Gall stated that if they don't do the work this

year, any contingency that you have budgeted will go away. You would have to re-encumber some contingency after the first of the year. The hope is that they'll come back and get a permit.

Mr. Belter asked if there were any other questions. Hearing none, I'd like to open a public hearing on the proposed additional appropriation outlined in Resolution RC-2004-9. Hearing none, I'll close the public hearing. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Mr. Buck said I'll lay out some construction drawings as they stand right now for the Tapawingo South extension project. We are currently in the right of way acquisition phase of that and I want to bring you up to date. *(Tapawingo South Extension between State Street and South River Road)* There will be two parcels that will be cut off and then the main parcel that will remain. We are also needing to acquire an easement from the railroad and that process is also underway. The appraisals are currently being prepared for the three parcels. We expect to get that wrapped up and taken care of hopefully by the end of November, at the latest. Ms. Martin had mentioned that some of the funding would be coming from the Levee/Village TIF and that's the reason why I'm here today giving you an update of where this stands. Once we know what the dollar values are, we'll know what portions will need to come from where. The construction plans are progressing. The geotechnical report is done and they are incorporating those results into the pavement design that will be done for this project. As far as construction plans go, they are about 80% complete right now. We hope to be able to lift the project as early in the spring as possible and have a full construction year next year to build a new roadway as well as connections.

Mr. Andrew asked what the volumes will be. Mr. Buck stated that right now the twenty year volume is 8,700 but that does not include the changes to the Purdue Transportation Plan that are being proposed by the University, which would up it close to 20,000 vehicles per day potentially for using this cut through.

Mr. Nay asked if this will stay the same grade or if it will be raised. *(The length of Tapawingo Road)* Mr. Buck stated that this is raised quite a bit through here *(at the east most end) but it will go back down to present grade level as it goes west.* It is all above the flood plain.

Mr. Belter asked if we will be able to do some landscaping to separate the road from the railroad track. Mr. Buck stated that there is a line of trees proposed on both sides of the road.

Mr. Nay asked what the width of the road is expected to be. Mr. Buck stated that in meters it is 8 and another 7 ½.

Mr. Belter asked if we end up with a full left turn lane. Mr. Buck answered yes. Mr. Belter asked if this will be four lanes wide then. Mr. Buck stated that is correct, with a right turn lane, a left turn lane, and two (narrower than what is there now) straight through lanes.

Mr. Belter asked what we are going to do to with Williams Street. Mr. Buck stated that right now as part of this project, the only improvement will be pavement markings, the crosswalk, and the actual stop. Purdue is very concerned about that leg of Williams Street with the back up at Grant having to wait to get onto Grant Street. We'll have to look at the traffic flow up there too to help traffic flow along Williams. For the long range transportation view, we envision Williams Street being one of our next major projects.

Mr. Gall stated that someone at last month's meeting asked if the drawings were beginning to reflect the relocation of the traffic signal control box at the corner of Tapawingo and State. Mr. Buck stated that the controller on the northeast corner is now there.

Mr. Belter stated that the next item of business is the Technology Development Grant Agreement. Mr. Andrew stated that it is an agreement between the Redevelopment Commission and Purdue. The money comes through you to Purdue. It's not to exceed two million dollars. We have two grants. The first one was this spring for \$750,000. The second one in August or September was \$1,125,000. The grand total of \$1,875,000 is to be used for construction and administration costs in the Certified Tech Park.

Mr. Belter stated that their plan right now is to use the majority of that money towards the addition to the Purdue Technology Center that would be creating wet lab space. Part of the legislation established some money for infrastructure and the administration had to apply for that as a grant. Purdue applied for it with our endorsement. The projects outlined and the legislation states that the Redevelopment Commission approves the expenditures. In preparation for once we've received the money and appropriated it, we must enter into an agreement with them.

Mr. Nay made a motion to approve the Technology Development Grant Agreement. Ms. Pearlman seconded.

Mr. Belter asked if there were any questions or comments. Mr. Nay asked, if I understand you correctly, PRF will bring this to us on how they intend to spend this. Mr. Bauman stated that it is already set forth in the agreement with the state. Mr. Belter stated that they would present claims to us.

Mr. Corrigan asked if they will have to come to us and say here is what we want to do. Mr. Belter stated that they have already done that. Mr. Bauman stated that it is divided in the grant between the improvements or construction on the Purdue Technology Center wing and then to channel operating costs.

Mr. Belter stated that I do believe though, Chris, that they do need to come to us and say here is documentation of what we are spending. Mr. Bauman stated that it is already tied down to what it has to be spent on.

Ms. Hoyer asked if this is the money that we were hoping to get to be the first technology center. Mr. Belter said yes, but this was allocated in phases. Mr. Bauman stated that there are two pots of money here. One is the Technology Development Grant Fund and the other will be income tax increments. This is the grant money that we are discussing.

(Talking over one another; unable to transcribe.)

Mr. Andrew stated that we are still waiting on the property of the income tax and sales tax figures.

Mr. Belter asked if there were any other questions or comments. None were made. The motion passed unanimously 4-0.

Ms. Rhodes asked when it was thought that we'd see the money. Mr. Andrew stated that he had no idea. The 1.125 was a surprise to us. We didn't know we were going to get that.

Mr. Belter asked if there was anything else that we need to discuss. Mr. Gall stated that I need a little direction on finishing up the Chauncey Street & Utility Project. The lights are up and burning. We've got trees to put in and some landscaping to finish up. One of the last things that we wanted to do out there was furnishing that area along Chauncey Street with benches and trash containers. I need some direction involving moving some money from Sidewalk Improvements. In the JR Kelly purchase order there is approximately \$7,499 remaining because that purchase order was written for 20% above their proposal amount. Those would be sufficient funds to buy benches, trash containers, and a radius bench to go around the light pole on the corner. I think we can do that without you having to reallocate monies from one to another. My question is if that is correct. Ms. Rhodes stated that the reason why we try to keep that sidewalk and curb money together is when we are making the local road street report. I'd prefer not to do that. It would be a very simple transfer next time.

Mr. Gall continued by stating that a follow up question to that is that we have done some landscaping and some trees will be planted in November. Again, do those fit into the infrastructure improvements budget or not? The funds are available. Basically if you look at the project, \$75,000 is not allocated. Almost \$50,000 of it will be eaten up by the Cinergy invoice that should be here next month. In addition to that we've got some landscaping to do and we anticipate purchasing banners for the banner poles that went up. We are just in the process of trying to finish that up and I didn't know if we should do it and then when the invoices come, have you move the funds to the proper account.

Mr. Belter stated that since the dollar amount is not changing, I would say that you should go ahead and do it as long as we move the dollars to the correct account before we approve the payment.

Mr. Gall stated that the last follow up question to this is that by the time you are done with all of that, there is still \$10,000 to \$15,000 left in the appropriation. Some time ago when the library planned development was occurring, benches and trash containers around that area were taken up that the city had put out there during previous sidewalk projects. We have them but they don't really fit back in with all that's going back up and they are pretty beat up. Parks intends to fix them up and use them in better places. Do you want to spend that money on benches and trash containers and potentially picnic tables for that public area that's out there along Northwestern?

Mr. Andrew stated that the original streetscape that was in there was put in by CDBG funds about 8 or 9 years ago.

Mr. Belter asked if the library has an opinion on this. Mr. Gall stated that of course they'd like this to happen.

Ms. Hoyer stated that I think we need benches and we certainly can't have too many trash cans.

Mr. Gall stated that I just can't tell if the appropriation allows it or not. Ms. Rhodes stated that you appropriated it to an expenditure project account. There's no reason why you can't use it.

(More discussion was made but too many were talking at once.)

Mr. Nay asked Mr. Payne if there are plans to put benches or trash containers at appropriately convenient places along the new trails. Mr. Payne stated that we are rapidly looking towards getting all of our landscaping figured out and then we'll figure out what we have left. We have promised that yes, once we finish the landscaping, we'll be planting some other resting areas. Mr. Nay asked if those older benches would be appropriate for use there. Mr. Payne stated that for the trails network we are keeping the theme that we started with.

Mr. Belter stated that unless anyone else on the Commission has a strong feeling against it, I'd say go ahead and proceed. Mr. Gall said thank you.

Mr. Belter asked if there were any other questions or comments from the public. None were made.

The Commission stated their next two meetings as being November 19th and December 17th at 12:30 pm

Mr. Nay made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Pearlman seconded. The meeting adjourned at 1:24 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Earle Nay, Recording Secretary

Approved:

Stephen Belter, President

/clp